

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application. Claims 6, 8, 12-14, 17, and 21-24 have been amended. Reconsideration of the rejection of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to various informalities. Replacement sheets are provided attached to this Amendment for the Examiner's approval. As "protected storage" designation in objects 370 and 470, the wording has been changed to refer to storing (e.g., in a protected storage) commensurate with the specification. In addition, the specification has been amended to consistently refer to element 140 as protected storage. In view of the replacement drawing sheets and the amendment to the specification, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 8 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to provide an enabling specification. These claims have been amended to be more in-line with claim 24, which includes a similar feature. In view of these amendments, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph is respectfully requested.

Claims 6-14, 16-19, 21-23, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as failing to distinctly claim the invention. These claims have been amended in response to this rejection. In view of these amendments, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6-14, 16-19, 21-23, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a)

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 15, and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,748,084 to Isikoff ("Isikoff"). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isikoff in view of "Official Notice." Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isikoff in view of U.S. Publication No. 20020194500 to Bajikar ("Bajikar"). Claims 7, 11-13 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isikoff in view of "Windows NT Server 4 Security Handbook," 1997 to Hadfield et al. ("Hadfield"). Claims 8-10 and 17-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isikoff in view of Hadfield and U.S. Patent No. 6,438,690 to Patel et al. ("Patel") and "Protecting Laptops with iKey and Intel Protected Access Architecture" by Rainbow Technologies ("Rainbow"). Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isikoff in view of Hadfield, Patel, and further in view of Bajikar. Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,166,688 to Cromer et al. ("Cromer"). Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer in view of Isikoff. Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer in view of Hadfield and Patel.

Embodiments of the present invention concern a radio location based theft recovery mechanism. In one embodiment, a locator subsystem is provided connected to a host chipset to

determine a current location of a mobile system. A main storage is provided that contains an application configured to access the locator subsystem and determine whether the mobile system may been stolen or used inappropriately based on security policies.

Isikoff fails to teach or suggest at least a locator subsystem. In Isikoff, a beacon is equipped in a laptop computer. This beacon assists in determining whether the laptop has been stolen by through the receipt of messages from a an external broadcast system. (see, e.g., Col. 4, line 62 to Col. 5, line 11. Accordingly, through this system, the user who has lost his/her laptop computer can have the external system send an appropriate signal to the beacon to indicate that the laptop should take special measures. Alternatively, the beacon could receive, periodically, a signal that indicates that normal processing is to occur, and intentionally withholding such a signal could cause laptop to take special measures. One problem with such a system is that, after a computer is stolen, it could take an inordinate amount of time before receiving the appropriate signal from the external system, or to determine that it has not received the expected signal from the external system. During this time, all files could conceivably be accessed by the unauthorized person handling the laptop. The location subsystem is a feature of each of independent claims 1 and 15, and claims 2-14 and 16-23 depend from and further define these claims. None of the additional references cited against these claims teach or suggest this feature. Accordingly reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 103(a) is respectfully requested.

With respect to claims 24-26, claim 24 has been amended to refer to the system BIOS as being configured in accordance with IPAA. Cromer refers to a laptop system detects when it has moved out of an authorized area the power supply shuts off. There is no disclosure or teaching of the IPAA feature of these claims in Cromer or the remaining cited references. Accordingly,

S/N 09/892,667

Office Action dated December 3, 2004

Response to Office Action dated June 2, 2005

reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendments and favorable action in connection with this application.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 or credit any overpayment to Kenyon and Kenyon Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON



Shawn W. O'Dowd
Registration No. 34,687
Attorney for Intel Corporation

Date: June 2, 2005

KENYON & KENYON
1500 K Street, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Ph.: (202) 220-4200
Fax.: (202) 220-4201
DC1-559579

S/N 09/892,667

Office Action dated December 3, 2004

Response to Office Action dated June 2, 2005

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Replacement drawing sheets for Figures 1 and 3-7 have been submitted for the
Examiner's approval.